



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

57

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,857	01/15/2002	Salil Vjaykumar Pradhan	100110473-1	1627

7590

06/22/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/051,857

Applicant(s)

PRADHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to because proper legends were missing. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 8,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term “otherwise” is not clearly defined. It is unclear the claimed “otherwise” refers to “said item of information is NOT available”, or “said second wireless device NOT remains in communication with said wireless device”, or both.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carr (US: 6301617).

For claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 16, 17, Carr teaches on column 4 line 32 the Fig. 1 of Carr is a wireless network. Carr teaches on column 2 line 42-44 HTML page (claimed “message”) includes virtual URL (claimed “address”) and indicating of content (claimed “identifies said item of information”).

Carr teaches on column 4 line 64 to column 6 line 4 a third party sends a request to ISP Computer System #3 (claimed “second device”), the requested item of information is received from Computer System #2 when the Computer System #2 is on-line. Otherwise, when the

Art Unit: 2645

Computer System #2 is off-line, the request message is sent to the Computer System #4 (claimed “other wireless device”) when the Computer System #4 is on-line.

Regarding claims 2, 11, 19, the URL address is a web-based address.

Regarding claims 4, 12, 13, 20, 21 the request message sent to Computer System #4 is same as the message sent to Computer System #2 (reads on claimed “duplicate of said message”) by Computer System #3.

Regarding claims 5, 14, 22, Carr teaches on Fig. 1 Computer System #1 (reads on claimed “sensor”; see line 22-24 page 10 of specification – sensor includes devices taking text input from a user).

Regarding claim 7, Carr teaches on column 1 line 25-26 URL identifies (reads on claimed “identifier”) a web page. The claimed “message” (HTML page) must have a unique message identifier (URL).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2645

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6, 15, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Malkin et al (US: 2003/0014269). Carr failed to teach “said message comprises Extensible Markup Language (XML) code”. However, Malkin et al teach on section [0038] wireless communication request is formatted in XML. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Carr to have the “said message comprises Extensible Markup Language (XML) code” as taught by Malkin et al such that the modified system of Carr would be able to support the XML to the system users.

5. Claims 10, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr as applied to claim 1 above. Carr failed to teach “said content associated with said information item comprises said information content”. However, “Official Notice” is taken that the content of an information item can be either a full set of the information item or a subset of the information item. Therefore, the claimed “said content associated with said information item comprises said information content” is old and well known to one skilled in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Carr to have the “said content associated with said information item comprises said information content” such that the modified system of Carr would be able to support the content comprises said information item to the system users.

Art Unit: 2645

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Carneal et al (US: 6598048) teach distributed system and method for prefetching objects.

7. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (571) 272-7535. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (571) 272-7547. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

**Or faxed to Central FAX Number 703-872-9306.**

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



**FAN TSANG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**